



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/696,399

10/28/2003

Robert Ivkov

134848.01301

6391

21269 7590 06/11/2009  
PEPPER HAMILTON LLP  
ONE MELLON CENTER, 50TH FLOOR  
500 GRANT STREET  
PITTSBURGH, PA 15219

EXAMINER

LAURITZEN, AMANDA L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3737

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/11/2009

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/696,399	<b>Applicant(s)</b> IVKOV ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Amanda L. Lauritzen	<b>Art Unit</b> 3737	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-114 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19-110 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 111-114 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 12 March 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive and/or are moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Regarding double patenting rejection in view of claims 1, 2, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 61-67, 69 and 79 of US 6,997,863, applicant has cited portions of the specification as evidence there the current claims are not obvious in view of the conflicting claims; however, in considering double patenting, Examiner only pays attention to the claimed subject matter and, as it stands, this double patenting rejection is maintained.

Regarding double patenting rejection in view of claims 51-54, 57 and 58 of US 7,074,175, Applicants point out that the present invention is more broad. Examiner agrees and maintains this double patenting rejection on the same grounds. Depending claims have been added to the present application and they are purported by Applicants to distinguish from the conflicting claims; however, the claims previously examined are still considered obvious (particularly, the independent claim(s)) and the rejection is maintained.

Regarding the combination of Gray et al. and Itoh et al., it is noted that the probes disclosed are susceptors to the extent that they are magnetic, metallic and responsive to the magnetic field to the extent that it absorbs electromagnetic energy (see, for example, Gray et al. at col. 4, lines 28-46). The metallic acid salt of the probe of Itoh et al. also constitutes a susceptor. Additionally, this amendment to the claims is an obvious modification within the prior art.

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

1. Claims 1, 2, 3 and 8-10 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 7-10, 13-16, 41, 42, 45 and 49-51, 53-59, 62 and 72-74 of copending Application No. 11/258,598. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claim sets are directed to a thermotherapeutic system (or complementary method) requiring an alternating magnetic field, common details of a magnetic circuit, common details of a coil, common details of circular rotar (or rotating pair) of magnets to generate a magnetic flux, etc, with the instant claims being broader and therefore anticipated by the conflicting claims. The instant claims are broader in that they do not detail a specific frequency range for the AMF, nor do they prescribe a shape of the waveform.

Art Unit: 3737

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

2. Claim 1 is rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2, and 19-23 of copending Application No. 10/493,874.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both claim sets are directed to a thermotherapeutic system (or complementary method) prescribing an alternating magnetic field and associated inductor, with the instant claim(s) being broader and therefore anticipated by the conflicting claims. The instant claims are broader in that they do not detail a specific frequency range for the AMF.

3. Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 12 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1, 2, 51, 52, 53, 56, 57, 61-67, 69 and 79 of US 6,997,863.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the method of producing and administering an alternating magnetic field to a patient and executing an MR imaging sequence of the conflicting claims is complementary to, and therefore anticipates, the instant system. In other words, it is understood that the system of the current claims is necessitated by the method.

4. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 51-54, 57 and 58 of US 7,074,175. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the method for treating tissue by an alternating magnetic field, with details of inductively heating and the core/poles of the associated device of the conflicting claims necessitates the system of the instant claims.

Art Unit: 3737

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2, 12-15, 16, 17, 18 and 111-114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray et al. (US 6,167,313) in view of Itoh et al. (US 4,979,518).

Gray et al. disclose a bioprobe in the form of a temperature probe for use in a thermotherapy disease treatment including a susceptor in the form of a microcapsule suspension that is to be injected into the arterial blood supply of diseased tissue (col. 1, lines 22-34 for hyperthermia of cancerous cells; col. 4, line 43 for a temperature probe; also col. 9, lines 44-47 for the susceptor injector probe). The system includes an alternating magnetic field inducing inductor that produces an alternating magnetic field that will act to energize the injected material (col. 3, lines 1-15). The alternating magnetic field inductor is understood to include some generator or power source.

Gray et al disclose all features of the invention as substantially claimed, as detailed above, but the susceptor material is injected and is not specifically associated with the probe; however, Itoh et al teach a bioprobe for use with a hyperthermal system that includes a susceptor on the probe in the form of an iron oxide powder and a metallic acid salt (abstract; also col. 11, lines 14-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include a probe that comprises a susceptor as taught by Itoh et al for the purpose of

Art Unit: 3737

generating a heat reaction in the probe at the site of the susceptor upon exposure to the alternating magnetic field.

It is noted that the probes disclosed are susceptors to the extent that they are magnetic, metallic and responsive to the magnetic field to the extent that it absorbs electromagnetic energy (see, for example, Gray et al. at col. 4, lines 28-46). The metallic acid salt of the probe of Itoh et al. also constitutes a susceptor. Additionally, providing a susceptor as a bioprobe subject to an alternating magnetic field is obvious within the skill of the art.

Regarding claims 111-114, the method of Gray et al. is specific to obtaining of a temperature measure, such that progress can be monitored in raising a temperature of a sample above a given threshold (col. 1, lines 22-34).

During treatment, Gray et al specifies that patients are subject to a magnetic field with a desired strength and frequency (col. 5, lines 11-16). Since the patient is disclosed to be within the apparatus, it is understood that the poles of the magnet define a patient-receiving gap, as in claim 2.

Regarding claims 12-15, Gray cites use of antibodies in targeting cancerous cells. Known antibodies for use include those derivatives according to claim 14, 15.

Regarding claims 17 and 18, the system of Gray et al includes one or more bioprobes, the first being in the form of a temperature probe and the second being in the form of an injecting probe, which are understood to be distinct from one another.

7. Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray et al. (US 6,167,313) in view of Itoh et al. (US 4,979,518), as applied to claims 1 and 2, further in view of Huang et al. (US 2005/0151438, now US 7,239,061).

Art Unit: 3737

Gray et al as appended by the thermal probe of Itoh et al includes all features of the invention as substantially claimed but does not specifically address details of the inductor coil; however, Huang et al teach an inductor coil that produces a rotating AMF. Huang et al establishes what is conventional in the art, that is, modulating pulses coupled with an inductor in the appropriate polarity for a resultant alternating current in the inductor [0029]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, to include the configuration taught by Huang et al. in the system of Wang et al. in order to achieve expected results of generating an alternating current in an inductor.

8. Claims 5, 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray et al. (US 6,167,313) in view of Itoh et al. (US 4,979,518), as applied to claims 1 and 2, further in view of Mills (US 6,477,398).

Gray et al as appended by the thermal probe of Itoh et al includes all features of the invention as substantially claimed but does not specifically include subjecting the patient to a magnetic field in the context of imaging the patient; however, Mills teaches thermal therapy in conjunction with MR imaging (abstract; also col. 18, lines 8-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the pertinent art at the time of invention to modify the system of Gray et al (as used with the probe of Itoh et al) to include monitoring the patient with MR imaging during treatment to visualize the area of pathological tissue as well as the progress of treatment.

9. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gray et al. (US 6,167,313) in view of Itoh et al. (US 4,979,518), as applied to claim 1, further in view of Handy et al. (US 2003/0032995, now US 6,997,863).



Art Unit: 3737

While Gray et al disclose use of antibodies in a targeted thermal therapy system, it is not specifically disclosed that one or more ligands are used; however, Handy et al establishes that it is desirous to use magnetic particles in an injection that attach to a target-specific ligand (abstract; also [0008], [0009]). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the relevant art at the time of invention to include a ligand for binding to a targeted site as taught by Handy et al [0009].

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amanda L. Lauritzen whose telephone number is (571)272-4303. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30am - 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 3737

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian L. Casler can be reached on (571) 272-4956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Amanda L. Lauritzen/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3737

/BRIAN CASLER/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit  
3737